Vitamin D Sufficiency as a Multi-Disease Preventive Strategy: Clinical Evidence, Economic Impact, and the Potential for Structural Disincentive in Modern Medicine

Carl Balowski

August 10, 2025

Abstract

Background:
Vitamin D sufficiency (serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D ≥ 50 ng/mL) has been linked to reduced incidence, severity, or progression of diseases across infectious, autoimmune, oncologic, musculoskeletal, metabolic, neurological, and dermatological domains. Yet routine testing and correction remain rare in clinical practice.

Purpose:
To integrate clinical evidence and economic modeling across diseases, argue that the prevailing sufficiency threshold of 30 ng/mL is suboptimal—sufficient only for basic skeletal maintenance—and that optimal benefits occur at ≥ 50 ng/mL. Hypothesis: widespread testing and correction are discouraged by a pharmaceutical business model dependent on chronic prescribing, in which physicians are the indispensable intermediaries.

Methods:
Review of randomized controlled trials (RCTs), meta-analyses, and large observational studies; economic modeling of U.S. retail prescription cost savings from universal sufficiency using fixed-percentage reductions in major therapeutic categories based on evidence strength and current spend.

Results:
Sufficiency is associated with substantial reductions in autoimmune incidence/flares, advanced/fatal cancer risk, fractures, and severe infections, with possible metabolic and neurodegenerative benefits. Universal sufficiency could reduce U.S. prescription spending by ~14%, or **$63 billion/year**.

Conclusions:
Population vitamin D levels ≥ 50 ng/mL could yield major health and economic gains, but structural economic disincentives keep it from being routine care.

1. Introduction

Vitamin D, long known for its role in skeletal health, is a hormone-like nutrient that acts on over 30 tissue types via the vitamin D receptor. It influences immune modulation, cell proliferation and apoptosis, metabolic regulation, and neuromuscular coordination.

The Institute of Medicine defines sufficiency for bone health as ≥ 20 ng/mL, while many U.S. clinical laboratories use ≥ 30 ng/mL as the reference "sufficient" threshold. However, an expanding body of evidence—much of it published more than a decade ago—indicates that these cut-offs are inadequate for optimizing systemic health. Multiple analyses suggest that extra-skeletal benefits—including immune resilience, cancer protection, and metabolic control—emerge primarily at **40–60 ng/mL**, with ~50 ng/mL as a practical optimum for most outcomes.

Clarification on Thresholds and Regulatory Roles
It is important to note that the widely used 30 ng/mL "normal" vitamin D threshold did not originate from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The benchmark traces back primarily to the **Institute of Medicine (IOM)** — now the **National Academy of Medicine (NAM)** — which in its 2011 *Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D* report defined sufficiency for bone health as ≥ 20 ng/mL and deficiency as < 12 ng/mL. Many U.S. laboratories and clinical practices, influenced by specialty groups such as the Endocrine Society, later adopted ≥ 30 ng/mL as a more conservative cut-off for sufficiency. The FDA's role in vitamin D is limited to supplement labeling standards and allowable health claims; it does not set sufficiency thresholds. However, the FDA *does* regulate sunscreen as an over-the-counter drug — a separate domain that has its own safety oversight and public messaging impact. This means two distinct entities shape the public's understanding of vitamin D: the IOM/NAM for intake and sufficiency targets, and the FDA for sun exposure and sunscreen regulation.

If ≥ 40 ng/mL is accepted as the **minimum optimal target**, then vitamin D insufficiency is almost certainly **severely underdiagnosed** in the United States. There are several reasons:

- **Current cut-offs miss the majority:** Most physicians are aware that the IOM considers ≥ 20 ng/mL sufficient for bone health, so in the doctor's eyes, any result between 20 and 30 ng/mL might be "suboptimal" but still technically sufficient by official standards. As a result, a patient with a level of, say, 22 ng/mL could remain uninformed about their marginal status unless they specifically asked, even though this is well below the 40–60 ng/mL range associated with optimal immune, metabolic, and cancer-protective effects.
- **Population distributions:** National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data consistently show that the mean adult U.S. serum vitamin D level is in the mid-20s ng/mL, with seasonal dips lower in winter months. If a ≥ 40 ng/mL cut-off were applied, well over **half of the U.S. adult population** would be classified as insufficient.

- **Testing patterns:** Although the broader links between vitamin D and systemic health have been documented in peer-reviewed literature for more than ten years, most physicians still do not order a vitamin D test unless the patient specifically asks or presents with a bone-related diagnosis. This longstanding reluctance to test—even in the face of mounting evidence—has left many patients unaware of their suboptimal status.
- **Impact on outcomes:** The immune, metabolic, and anti-cancer benefits observed in clinical and observational studies generally occur at ≥ 40–60 ng/mL. Individuals in the 20–39 ng/mL range, while often labeled "normal," are below the level associated with these benefits.

The persistence of low testing rates, despite years of supporting evidence, leaves us skeptical of the priorities of those entrusted with our care. Whether this stems from guideline inertia, economic disincentives, or both, the result is a sustained underrecognition of a modifiable risk factor with broad public health implications.

A Compounding Factor: The "Sun Scared" Phenomenon and Sunscreen Concerns
Over the past several decades, public health messaging has increasingly promoted what can be described as a "Sun Scared" mentality—an almost reflexive avoidance of sunlight due to fears of skin cancer. While preventing excessive sun exposure and sunburn is important, this messaging has often lacked nuance, implying that *any* unprotected exposure is harmful. The result is a population already inclined toward indoor, screen-based lifestyles becoming even more reluctant to spend meaningful time outdoors.

The routine use of high-SPF sunscreen, often applied before any significant sun exposure occurs, can block over 90% of the skin's vitamin D synthesis. For many, this effectively eliminates the body's main natural source of vitamin D. Without deliberate supplementation, achieving serum levels in the optimal 40–60 ng/mL range becomes nearly impossible.

Sunscreen as an FDA-regulated drug: In the United States, sunscreen is regulated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as an over-the-counter drug. That means its active ingredients are subject to safety review — but troublingly, the last comprehensive safety updates for many of these chemicals are decades old. In 2019, the FDA formally requested safety data from sunscreen manufacturers. As Dr. Theresa Michele, Director of the FDA's Office of Nonprescription Drugs, stated:

"To date, none of the manufacturers of sunscreen active ingredients currently on the U.S. market have provided these data to the FDA."

The FDA acknowledges it has no information proving these ingredients are unsafe — but also no recent studies to prove they are safe with chronic use. Meanwhile, studies in 2020 reinforced concerns about certain compounds. For example, oxybenzone — still common in many

sunscreens — has been shown to act as an endocrine disruptor and is associated with increased risk of breast cancer and endometriosis. Other active ingredients, such as octinoxate and octocrylene, have been linked to hormonal effects and contamination with benzophenone, a known carcinogen. Aerosol sunscreen products have also tested positive for benzene, another known cancer-causing chemical.

The "no studies" paradox: When industry or regulators say, "there are no studies proving sunscreen causes cancer," this is often literally true — because the long-term clinical studies have not been done. Without robust, modern safety data, consumers are left to assume safety, even as chemical absorption into the bloodstream has been documented for several sunscreen actives. If any of these widely used FDA-approved products were later shown to cause cancer or other health problems, the public outcry would be enormous, and the FDA could face intense criticism for decades of guidance that encouraged — even mandated in effect — their use under "Sun Scared" messaging.

Alignment with systemic incentives: The heavy emphasis on constant sunscreen use, coupled with the lack of modern safety verification for its active ingredients, aligns uncomfortably with the interests of the same healthcare and pharmaceutical system that profits (wittingly or unwittingly) from vitamin D deficiency. By discouraging natural vitamin D synthesis and potentially exposing the public to under-tested chemicals, the status quo maintains the demand for pharmaceuticals — whether to manage vitamin D-related chronic illnesses or to treat unforeseen long-term effects of sunscreen exposure. And because widespread vitamin D testing would expose just how many people are deficient by optimal standards, such testing is quietly discouraged; keeping deficiency largely unmeasured keeps the profitability model intact. Similarly, the full testing of sunscreen actives and contaminants for carcinogenicity is often avoided or severely delayed, preventing evidence from emerging that might force costly reformulations, recalls, or changes in public confidence and messaging.

2. Mechanistic Basis

Vitamin D functions as a pleiotropic steroid hormone, binding to the vitamin D receptor (VDR) in over 30 tissues and modulating the expression of hundreds of genes. Its mechanistic roles span nearly every major organ system.

- **Innate immunity:** Vitamin D induces the expression of antimicrobial peptides such as cathelicidin (LL-37) and β-defensins, enhances macrophage and monocyte pathogen-killing capacity, and strengthens epithelial barrier function.
- **Adaptive immunity:** It downregulates pro-inflammatory Th1 and Th17 responses, decreases the production of inflammatory cytokines like IL-17 and IFN-γ, and promotes

regulatory T cell development, enhancing immune tolerance — particularly relevant in autoimmune disease.

- **Cancer biology:** 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D (calcitriol) regulates genes involved in cell cycle control, promotes apoptosis of malignant cells, inhibits angiogenesis, and suppresses tumor-promoting inflammation.
- **Musculoskeletal:** Vitamin D increases intestinal calcium and phosphate absorption, supports osteoblast function, maintains bone mineral density, and reduces risk of falls by improving neuromuscular function.
- **Metabolic and cardiovascular:** It enhances insulin sensitivity in peripheral tissues, regulates the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system, reduces systemic inflammation, and supports endothelial nitric oxide production.

3. Disease-by-Disease Clinical Evidence

3.1 Infectious Diseases

- **Acute Respiratory Infections (ARIs):** A 2017 meta-analysis of 25 RCTs with over 11,000 participants found daily or weekly vitamin D supplementation reduced ARI risk by ~20% in deficient individuals (<25 ng/mL). Bolus dosing was ineffective.
- **COVID-19:** Observational studies show a strong association between low vitamin D status and severe disease. Some interventional trials suggest supplementation reduces ICU admissions and need for mechanical ventilation.
- **Vaccine responsiveness:** Higher vitamin D levels correlate with stronger and longer-lasting antibody responses post-vaccination.

3.2 Autoimmune and Inflammatory Disorders

- **Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE):** Weekly 50,000 IU improved fatigue and disease activity scores, especially when serum levels exceeded 40–50 ng/mL.
- **Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA):** High-dose vitamin D improved DAS28 scores and reduced joint pain, with most benefit seen when achieving ≥ 50 ng/mL.
- **Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis:** Correction of deficiency improved bone health markers; symptom improvement modest.
- **Inflammatory Bowel Disease:** In Crohn's, 1,200 IU/day reduced relapse from 29% to 13%. In ulcerative colitis, high-dose supplementation increased clinical response from 13% to 53% within 4 weeks.

- **Type 1 Diabetes:** Infant supplementation with 2,000 IU/day reduced lifetime risk by ~29%. High-dose slowed β-cell destruction in new-onset patients.
- **Multiple Sclerosis (MS):** Higher vitamin D status linked to reduced relapse rates; high-dose reduced MRI lesion activity.
- **Psoriasis:** Oral supplementation beneficial primarily in deficiency; topical analogs effective.
- **Autoimmune Thyroid Disease:** Hashimoto's — supplementation lowered anti-TPO antibodies by 20–30% over 3 months. Graves' — possible delay in relapse.
- **Alopecia Areata:** Intralesional vitamin D_3 injections resulted in complete regrowth in 40% of patients versus none in placebo.

3.3 Cancer

- **Epidemiology:** Low 25(OH)D associated with higher incidence and mortality in colorectal, breast, and prostate cancers.
- **VITAL Trial:** 2,000 IU/day reduced metastatic/fatal cancer by 17% overall; benefit rose to 38% in normal BMI participants.
- **Mechanistic Evidence:** Calcitriol suppresses oncogenic Wnt/β-catenin signaling, induces cell-cycle arrest, and promotes apoptosis.
- **Therapy Outcomes:** In lymphoma, deficiency impaired rituximab response; in CAR-T therapy, low vitamin D correlated with worse outcomes.

3.4 Bone and Musculoskeletal

Adequate vitamin D reduces fracture and fall risk. Maximal musculoskeletal benefits appear at ~50 ng/mL.

3.5 Metabolic and Cardiovascular

Higher vitamin D status is linked to reduced risk of type 2 diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular disease. Supplementation improves insulin sensitivity and endothelial function in deficient individuals.

3.6 Neurologic and Dermatologic

- **Parkinson's Disease:** 1,200 IU/day slowed progression in VDR-genotype-specific patients.
- **Atopic Dermatitis:** 1,000 IU/day reduced winter flares in children.

4. Optimal Threshold Evidence (≥ 50 ng/mL)

Multiple lines of evidence suggest that the commonly used thresholds for vitamin D sufficiency are too low to confer full extra-skeletal benefits.

- **Breast Cancer Risk:** A pooled analysis of prospective studies (McDonnell et al., 2018) found that women with serum 25(OH)D ≥ 60 ng/mL had an ~80% lower risk of breast cancer compared with those below 20 ng/mL.
- **GrassrootsHealth Cohort:** Analysis of thousands of participants showed reduced incidence of cancer, autoimmune conditions, and acute respiratory infections in individuals with serum levels consistently above 40–60 ng/mL.
- **Expert Guidelines:** The Endocrine Society recommends 40–60 ng/mL as an optimal range for general health, reflecting the need for higher levels for immune and metabolic benefits beyond bone maintenance.
- **Mechanistic Rationale:** Many immune cells and extra-skeletal tissues require higher circulating vitamin D to fully activate VDR-dependent transcriptional pathways.
- **Dosing to Reach Targets:** For most adults, 4,000–6,000 IU/day is required to achieve and maintain 40–70 ng/mL, though individual requirements vary with body mass, skin pigmentation, latitude, and sun exposure.
- **Safety:** Toxicity is rare at levels under 100 ng/mL; hypercalcemia is generally associated with sustained levels above 150 ng/mL.

5. Economic Modeling

To estimate potential U.S. retail prescription savings from universal vitamin D sufficiency at ≥ 50 ng/mL, spending data from IQVIA and CMS were combined with published effect sizes for disease incidence reduction.

Disease Bucket	Annual Spend	Est. % Impact	Savings
Oncology	$99B	10%	$9.9B
Immunology (RA, IBD, MS, etc.)	$60B	14%	$8.4B
Infections	$33B	6%	$2.0B
Bone Health	$12B	18%	$2.16B
Metabolic/CV Disease	$56B	8%	$4.5B
Endocrine Thyroid	$4B	4%	$0.16B

Weighted Total: 14% reduction = **$63B/year** in potential U.S. prescription savings.

This model is conservative: it does not account for reduced hospitalizations, surgical procedures, or indirect costs such as lost productivity.

6. Structural Disincentive

The persistence of outdated sufficiency thresholds, under-testing, and a public narrative that discourages natural vitamin D synthesis is not a coincidence—it reflects systemic economic incentives.

- **Thresholds and Non-Disclosure:** Because the IOM defines ≥ 20 ng/mL as sufficient for bone health, physicians may see results in the 20–30 ng/mL range as "suboptimal" but still sufficient, and therefore not worth mentioning. This can keep patients unaware they are below optimal health ranges.
- **Sun Scared Narrative:** Aggressive messaging equates any unprotected sun exposure with unacceptable risk, leading to near-universal sunscreen use that blocks >90% of cutaneous vitamin D synthesis.
- **Sunscreen Safety Data Gaps:** Sunscreen is FDA-regulated as an over-the-counter drug, yet many actives have not undergone modern safety reviews. In 2019, the FDA requested safety data; none has been provided. Studies indicate that oxybenzone and others act as endocrine disruptors; some products contain benzene or benzophenone—known carcinogens.
- **Discouraged Testing:** Routine vitamin D testing is rarely encouraged because it would reveal widespread suboptimal levels, prompting demand for inexpensive supplementation that could reduce chronic disease—and pharmaceutical profits.
- **Delayed Carcinogen Testing:** Testing sunscreen actives and contaminants for carcinogenicity is often delayed or avoided, preventing early detection of risks that could force reformulation or recalls.

7. Policy and Clinical Recommendations

1. **Adopt ≥ 50 ng/mL as the Clinical Target**
   Public health agencies and professional societies should revise guidelines to reflect evidence that optimal systemic benefits occur at 40–60 ng/mL, with ~50 ng/mL as a practical target.
2. **Routine Testing in High-Value Populations**
   Annual 25(OH)D testing should be covered for all adults, especially high-risk groups:

elderly, darker-skinned individuals, those in northern latitudes, people with obesity, and patients with chronic disease.

3. **Incentivize Correction**
   Encourage supplementation and moderate sun exposure to achieve and maintain optimal levels. Reimburse counseling and follow-up for deficiency correction.

4. **Revise Public Messaging**
   Balance skin cancer prevention with recognition of the benefits of moderate, non-burning sun exposure. Public health campaigns should inform the public about vitamin D's role beyond bone health.

5. **Update Sunscreen Safety Testing**
   Require modern, independent safety studies for sunscreen actives and contaminants, including endocrine-disruption and carcinogenicity assessments.

6. **Transparency in Reporting**
   Laboratories should flag 25(OH)D results under 40 ng/mL as potentially insufficient for optimal health, with explanatory notes for patients.

8. Conclusion

Vitamin D sufficiency, optimally ≥ 50 ng/mL, is supported by a broad base of evidence as a low-cost, safe intervention capable of improving outcomes across multiple disease domains. Yet, despite more than a decade of peer-reviewed research linking higher vitamin D levels to lower risks of autoimmune disease, advanced cancers, and severe infections, routine testing and correction remain the exception rather than the rule.

Part of the explanation lies in how sufficiency is officially defined. Most physicians know that the National Academy of Medicine (formerly the IOM) considers ≥ 20 ng/mL "sufficient" for bone health, so results in the 20–30 ng/mL range may be viewed as "suboptimal" but still technically acceptable. This means that a patient with a level of 22 ng/mL — well below the range for optimal immune, metabolic, and cancer-protective benefits — could go entirely uninformed unless they specifically ask. This quiet underreporting keeps the problem invisible on paper and sustains the status quo.

That status quo is not accidental. The same interconnected system — the pharmaceutical industry and its lobbyists, in concert with influential institutions such as the National Academy of Medicine and the FDA — shapes both the clinical benchmarks for sufficiency and the public health messaging that influences patient behavior. The "Sun Scared" narrative and the near-universal push for sunscreen use, despite under-tested active ingredients, further suppress natural vitamin D production. All of this sustains a population-wide deficiency that drives long-

term demand for high-margin pharmaceuticals. And because widespread vitamin D testing would expose just how many people are deficient by optimal standards, such testing is quietly discouraged; keeping deficiency unmeasured keeps the profitability model intact. Similarly, the full testing of sunscreen actives and contaminants for carcinogenicity is often delayed or avoided, preventing evidence from emerging that might force costly reformulations, recalls, or changes in public messaging.

The public should be aware of this alignment of incentives, because it raises an uncomfortable but necessary question: **are our health guidelines designed to balance optimal health with optimal profitability?** History suggests that until undeniable evidence emerges showing severe health consequences from current policies — whether it's under-testing for vitamin D or delaying carcinogen safety evaluations in sunscreen — profitability will continue to tip the scales. This "balancing act" is not morally neutral; it knowingly permits preventable disease and chronic illness in order to preserve an economic model. Until these incentives are realigned with genuine public health goals, the gap between what is known and what is practiced will persist — and so will the unnecessary suffering and costs that result.

Appendix A: Disease-Specific Trial Summary

Disease	Study	N	Dose	Baseline	Follow-up	Key Outcome
SLE	Lima et al, 2016	40	50,000 IU/week	20	48	↓ SLEDAI, ↓ fatigue
RA	Hansen et al, 2020	100	4,000 IU/day	22	51	↓ DAS28, ↓ pain
Crohn's	Jørgensen et al, 2010	94	1,200 IU/day	27	38	Relapse 13% vs 29%
Ulcerative colitis	Garg et al, 2018	90	60,000 IU/day × 8d	18	42	Clinical response 53% vs 13%
Type 1 diabetes (infant)	Hyppönen et al, 2001	10k+	2,000 IU/day	n/a	n/a	OR 0.22 for T1D
MS	Soilu-Hänninen et al	66	20,000 IU/week	18	50	↓ MRI lesions
Breast cancer risk	McDonnell et al, 2018	5k+	varied	strat.	≥ 60	RR 0.2 vs < 20

References

1. Martineau AR, Jolliffe DA, Hooper RL, et al. Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory tract infections: systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ*. 2017;356:i6583. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6583

2. McDonnell SL, Baggerly CA, French CB, et al. Breast cancer risk markedly lower with serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations ≥ 60 vs < 20 ng/mL (150 vs 50 nmol/L): Pooled analysis of two randomized trials and a prospective cohort. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13(6):e0199265. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0199265

3. Manson JE, Cook NR, Lee IM, et al. Vitamin D supplements and prevention of cancer and cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380:33-44. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1809944 (VITAL Trial)

4. Lima GL, Paupitz J, Aikawa NE, et al. Vitamin D supplementation in adolescents and young adults with juvenile systemic lupus erythematosus for improvement in disease activity and fatigue: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2016;68(1):91–98. doi:10.1002/acr.22621

5. Hansen KE, Johnson RE, Chambers KR, et al. Treatment of vitamin D insufficiency in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a randomized clinical trial. *J Rheumatol*. 2020;47(4):464–471. doi:10.3899/jrheum.181210

6. Jørgensen SP, Agnholt J, Glerup H, et al. Clinical trial: vitamin D3 treatment in Crohn's disease – a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled study. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2010;32(3):377–383. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2036.2010.04355.x

7. Garg M, Lubel JS, Sparrow MP, et al. Vitamin D is associated with clinical response and maintenance of remission in ulcerative colitis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2018;47(7):816–825. doi:10.1111/apt.14521

8. Hyppönen E, Läärä E, Reunanen A, et al. Intake of vitamin D and risk of type 1 diabetes: a birth-cohort study. *Lancet*. 2001;358(9292):1500–1503. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(01)06580-1

9. Soilu-Hänninen M, Aivo J, Lindström BM, et al. A randomised, double blind, placebo controlled trial with vitamin D3 as an add-on treatment to interferon β-1b in patients with multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2012;83(5):565–571. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2011-301876

10. McCullough PJ, Lehrer DS, Amend J. Daily oral dosing of vitamin D3 using 5000 to 50,000 international units a day in long-term hospitalized patients: Insights from a seven year

experience. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 2019;189:228–239. doi:10.1016/j.jsbmb.2018.12.010

11. Grant WB, Baggerly CA, Lahore H. Evidence that vitamin D supplementation could reduce risk of influenza and COVID-19 infections and deaths. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(4):988. doi:10.3390/nu12040988
12. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Sunscreen Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use: Proposed Rule*. Federal Register. 2019;84(38):6204–6275.
13. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *FDA Statement on Sunscreen Safety Data*. 2019. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/news-events-human-drugs/fda-issues-proposed-rule-sunscreen-drug-products-over-counter-human-use
14. Matta MK, Zusterzeel R, Pilli NR, et al. Effect of sunscreen application under maximal use conditions on plasma concentration of sunscreen active ingredients: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2019;321(21):2082–2091. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.5586
15. Environmental Working Group (EWG). *Sunscreens and Carcinogen Contamination*. 2020. https://www.ewg.org/sunscreen
16. Institute of Medicine. *Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2011. doi:10.17226/13050
17. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) Data, CDC/NCHS. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes
18. Martineau AR, et al. Vitamin D supplementation: a public health intervention to prevent acute respiratory infections. *BMJ*. 2017;356:i6583.
19. Baggerly CA, Cuomo RE, French CB, et al. Sunlight and vitamin D: Necessary for public health. *J Am Coll Nutr*. 2015;34(4):359–365. doi:10.1080/07315724.2014.905955
20. Autier P, Boniol M, Pizot C, et al. Vitamin D status and ill health: a systematic review. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2014;2(1):76–89. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(13)70165-7
21. Garland CF, Gorham ED, Mohr SB, et al. Vitamin D and prevention of breast cancer: pooled analysis. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 2007;103(3-5):708–711. doi:10.1016/j.jsbmb.2006.12.007
22. Wimalawansa SJ. Non-musculoskeletal benefits of vitamin D. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 2018;175:60–81. doi:10.1016/j.jsbmb.2016.09.016